



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/524,400	10/24/2005	Peter Clifton	4623-050231	4667
28289 7590 11/28/2008 THE WEBB LAW FIRM, P.C. 700 KOPPERS BUILDING 436 SEVENTH AVENUE PITTSBURGH, PA 15219				
EXAMINER ELOSHWAY, NIKI MARINA				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3781				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/28/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/524,400

Applicant(s)

CLIFTON ET AL.

Examiner

NIKI M. ELOSHWAY

Art Unit

3781

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 August 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-6 and 8-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-6 and 8-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8500)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/2/06
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1 and 3-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ho et al. (U.S. 5,699,933) in view of Setty (U.S. 5,713,484). Ho et al. teach a drinking apparatus, shown in figures 1A and 1B, having a container 1, a lid at 3, a valve, shown in figure 1B. The valve is biased closed by the spring 5B and by gravity. The apparatus of Ho et al. does not include a tamper indicating mechanism closure mechanism. Setty teaches that it is known to provide a container and lid with a tamper indicating closure mechanism. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the apparatus of Ho et al. with the lid and container having a tamper indicating closure mechanism, as taught by Setty, in order to prevent tampering.

Regarding claim 4, Ho et al. does not teach that the container is a cup. Setty teaches that it is known to provide a cup shaped container. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the apparatus of Ho et al. with the container being cup shaped, as taught by Setty, in order to give the container a more convention appearance.

4. Claims 1 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ho et al. (U.S. 5,699,933) in view of Setty (U.S. 5,713,484), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Pappas et al. (U.S. 2003/0233986A1). The modified apparatus of Ho et al. discloses the claimed invention except for the fluorescent markings. Pappas et al. teach that it is known to provide a dispensing mechanism with fluorescent markings (see paragraph [0075]). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the modified apparatus of Ho et al. with the valve element having fluorescent markings, as taught by Pappas et al., in order to increase the visual novelty of the device.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed August 20, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the Ho valve is not capable of preventing substances from being introduced into the container. The Examiner disagrees with this position. Claim 1 recites that "the valve element is biased to the closed condition and moves to the open condition responsive to liquid being drawn through the straw, wherein the apparatus completely encapsulates the internal cavity to thereby prevent substances from being introduced to the cavity". The Ho device meets these limitations. Ho discusses a prior art valve which is shown in figure 1B and has a ball valve which responds to pressure to dispense the contents. The ball moves to the open position in response to liquid being drawn through the straw and the ball closes the passage which would prevent substances from being introduced into the cavity.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NIKI M. ELOSHWAY whose telephone number is (571)272-4538. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Stashick can be reached on 571-272-4561. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Niki M. Eloshway/
Niki M. Eloshway
Examiner
Art Unit 3781

Art Unit: 3781

/Anthony D Stashick/
Anthony D Stashick
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3781